

Section VI

Strategic Plan

A. Revenue Outlook for 2000-2003

The Consortium does not foresee any major changes in the revenue stream at the federal level for the entitlement programs, other than the typical shifts that occur from year to year.

Community Development Block Grant:	\$7,000,000/year
HOME Investment Partnership:	3,250,000/year
Emergency Shelter Grant Program:	200,000/year
Total	\$10,450,000/year

Other funds:

- **Local Housing Opportunity Fund.** King County Housing Opportunity Fund has seen steady support—roughly \$3 million per year. This is , however, subject to annual appropriations by King County Council.
- **McKinney Homeless Assistance Programs.** In 1999, King County administered approximately \$3.6 million in McKinney Shelter Plus Care grant funds (rental assistance for homeless). King County also administers about \$565,000 in annual operating support for Supportive Housing Program grants (transitional units and supportive services). *McKinney funds to Seattle-King County have been declining in recent years, and the trend is expected to continue.*
- **Washington State Housing Trust Fund.** Sixty-five million dollars are available for 1999/2001 biennium; approximately 40% will go to Seattle/King County. The State also helps support operating costs for emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless people.
- **Washington State Housing Finance Commission.** Steady support for tax credit and bond programs, subject to Congressional review.
- **HUD HOPE VI Revitalization Grant.** Subject to approval of KCHA application - \$35 million and additional Section 8 vouchers available for revitalization of Park Lake I, a public housing complex in White Center, into a mixed-income housing community.

B. Objectives for Decent, Affordable Housing

The King County Consortium's priorities for investment in affordable housing incorporate extensive input from the community, service providers, private and nonprofit housing developers, local government staff, elected officials, and others. Extensive data analysis, work group meetings, and community forums informed these priorities.

General Priorities for Allocating Housing Investments

The Consortium's objectives are designed to address the housing needs of low- and moderate-income residents—that is, residents with incomes at or below 80 percent of the median for this area. We seek to promote diversity in neighborhoods, to revitalize distressed communities, to integrate affordable housing throughout all parts of the Consortium, to lessen the cost burden experienced by low income households, and to promote fair housing choice for all residents of King County outside Seattle.

In light of the number of persons in need, the Consortium will target housing funds to those whose needs are most pronounced. This includes people with low or no income, households on public assistance and other fixed incomes who cannot afford market rents, people with special needs, workers in low-wage jobs, and homeless people. At the same time, the Consortium recognizes that a wide range of other owner and renter households below 80 percent of median income need affordable housing support, including home repair and assistance with first-time home ownership.

The Consortium is committed to using a wide range of tools and partnerships other than direct federal funding to develop housing that is affordable more households with moderate incomes, in hopes that we can lessen the demand on the publicly subsidized housing.

The four housing objectives and activities listed in the section that follows reflect this important balance. The objectives, in no order of priority, are:

- *Housing Objective 1.* Preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households.
- *Housing Objective 2.* Provide a variety of appropriate housing programs for renters and owners with special needs.
- *Housing Objective 3.* Provide services and facilities to prevent homelessness and to address the needs of families and individuals when homelessness occurs.
- *Housing Objective 4.* Support a broad mix of housing initiatives and programs designed to increase the supply of affordable housing and access to it.

Housing Objective 1

Preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households.

1. Proposed Annual Accomplishments for 2000-2003

- Develop and/or preserve an average of **700 units**¹ each year that is affordable to renters and owners at or below 80 percent of median (total includes homeless and special needs housing programs, as well as housing repair).

Table 6-1
Estimated Performance Target for 2000-2003: Units Developed/Preserved

Population	Targeted # Units
Low- and moderate-income households <i>At or below 80% of median</i>	600
Special Needs Households	60
Homeless Households	40
TOTAL	700

Please note that these are estimates only, since the type of units developed will vary from year to year depending on the nature of projects funded and other factors.

- Provide housing assistance to an average of **1,600 low- and moderate-income renter and owner households** each year. We estimate that the households served will be divided among tenure type and income groups as follows:

Table 6-2
Estimated Performance Target for 2000-2003: Households Served

Income Group	Renters	Owners	TOTAL
Extremely low income <i>0-30% of median</i>	500 (50%)	240 (40%)	740
Low Income <i>31-50% of median</i>	400 (40%)	300 (50%)	700
Moderate Income <i>51-80% of median</i>	100 (10%)	60 (10%)	160
TOTAL	1,000	600	1,600

¹ Projected units are based on accomplishments over the last three year term of the Consortium interlocal agreement.

Estimates only. Please note that these are estimates only, since the type of household and income group served vary from year to year depending on the nature of projects funded and other factors. Counting towards accomplishment of these goals are any housing units developed or households assisted with any federal CDBG, HOME and ESG dollars contributing towards the performance targets. In many developments, federal funds are highly leveraged.

Based on the 1990 U.S. Census, nearly 70,000 low- and moderate-income renter households¹ in the Consortium are in need of housing assistance because they are paying more than 30 percent of their income for rent or living in overcrowded or substandard conditions (HUD analysis of U.S. Census data). The majority of those in need—63 percent—are renters. The most severely affected are those households with incomes below 50 percent of median who are paying more than half of their income for housing. Of the 70,000 households needing assistance, 24,127 of them fall into this category of severe cost burden.

Given the conditions of the local housing market and population increase, it is highly likely that the numbers of households in need of housing assistance has risen substantially since 1990. A 1998 Dupre+Scott study of the King County private (unsubsidized) housing stock found that the King County housing market offers very little affordable housing to those with incomes below 60 percent of median. Affordability problems are most severe in East King County, where only 9.5% of the housing stock is affordable to households between 30 and 50% of median income. South County provides more choices for this group, but vacancies are extremely low. Essentially no market rate rental housing was affordable to those with incomes below 30 percent of the median, severely limiting the housing options for the working poor, elderly, people with disabilities, and those who are homeless. Waiting lists for publicly assisted housing are long in the Consortium.

At a time when demand for housing assistance is already severe, the Consortium—along with communities throughout the nation—is facing the potential loss of project-based Section 8 housing. Numerous contracts between private owners and HUD will be expiring during the period covered by this Plan; some 665 of the 2,459 project-based Section 8 units in the Consortium are at high risk of converting to market rate.

2. Activities

Activities to Benefit Low- and Moderate-income Renters

- **Expand supply through acquisition and rehabilitation of rental units, and new construction of affordable rental units.** These are

¹ Defined as those with incomes at or below 80 percent of median.

the primary activities by which the Consortium will expand the supply of affordable rental units. CDBG, HOME, and local Housing Opportunity Fund (HOF) dollars will be allocated projects serving low- and moderate-income households.

Households with incomes at 30% of median or less have the greatest housing needs. In any given funding round, where the Consortium receives funding requests of otherwise similar quality and feasibility, preference will be given to those serving the lower income groups, all things being equal.

Affordability problems are most severe in East King County, where costs are high. In order to encourage affordable housing opportunities in all subregions of the County, the Consortium will consider these higher costs in making funding awards.

- **Preservation of existing affordable housing.** The Consortium will provide leadership and, as appropriate, funding to assist in preserving existing subsidized housing. The Consortium will work actively with local coalitions to explore and implement various tools for preserving project-based Section 8, such as providing incentives for current owners to stay in the program, or facilitating transfer of ownership to organizations that agree to maintain the affordability.
- **Rehabilitation of investor-owned rental properties.** HOME and CDBG funds will be used to maintain the Consortium-wide rental rehabilitation services, which provides owners with rehabilitation funds in exchange for keeping the units affordable to low- and moderate-income households for a specified period of time. There is a particular need in the South Urban subregion, where rental housing is generally more affordable, but where it also tends to suffer more from deferred maintenance.
- **Rental assistance.** Rental assistance for Consortium residents will be made available through the King County Housing Authority and the Renton Housing Authority Section 8 programs. In addition, homeless persons with chronic disabilities may be able to access rental assistance through federal grant funded King County Shelter Plus Care program. King County Consortium will work with local housing authorities in supporting applications for and planning for the use of any additional Section 8 rental assistance.
- **Incentives programs, removal of regulatory barriers, and other activities.** Consortium members will provide a wide variety of incentive programs and related activities to promote affordable housing development. Specific programs vary by Consortium jurisdiction. King County will employ the following:

School and roads fee exemptions

Density bonuses

Requirement that Master Planned Developments provide a percentage of housing ownership or rental housing affordable to households up to 80 percent of median income

Continue to prioritize use of surplus property for affordable housing development

Transit-oriented development

Transfer of development rights

Continue attempts to lower or slow the increase in development costs for multifamily housing by removing regulatory barriers

In addition, Consortium members will be encouraged to develop and implement incentive programs, and to adopt regulations to allow for accessory housing units, which are typically affordable to households at or below 80 percent of median.

- **Collaboration with the King County Housing Authority (“KCHA”) on new initiatives.** The King County Consortium supports the KCHA’s goal of providing high quality housing and community services to the residents of Park Lake Homes in White Center, and households awaiting subsidized housing. The KCHA and the Consortium will explore opportunities to obtain a HOPE VI Revitalization Grant for Park Lake I, and will collaborate in the planning process, provided that:
 - 1) KCHA will provide replacement housing for the public housing units that are redeveloped on a one-to-one basis, through replacement public housing and/or project-based vouchers at KCHA owned properties or other apartment units. Replacement units will be offered to relocated Park Lake tenants who choose that option, or secondarily, to households with incomes in the same range as, or lower than, households at Park Lake prior to the redevelopment;
 - 2) Park Lake residents will be given housing choices during relocation, and housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households will be enhanced in White Center and throughout the Consortium;
 - 3) KCHA conducts comprehensive outreach to Park Lake Homes residents, as well as residents of the broader White Center Community, in order to ensure that they have the opportunity to participate in the planning of the redevelopment

and relocation activities through specific meetings which are established for their participation. Such meetings should include, but not be limited to, the topics of unit mix, housing design, density and open space, replacement housing options, continued social service support for relocated residents and housing options in the new Park Lake community;

- 4) Park Lake Homes residents will receive special HOPE VI Demolition Relocation Plan services, as specified in the HOPE VI application, including one-to-one housing counseling and self-sufficiency programs that will help the tenants sustain their new living arrangement.
- 5) KCHA continues to inform the Consortium of the progress of the HOPE VI project, including any evaluative studies of the mixed-income housing community at Park Lake and the relocated tenants, and any studies of HOPE VI projects released by HUD.

The Park Lake HOPE VI initiative is consistent with and would further several of the Consortium's objectives to address housing needs, including: the promotion of an equitable and rational distribution of affordable housing throughout King County, the promotion of diverse neighborhoods, the revitalization of substandard housing and distressed communities and the promotion of fair housing choice for all residents of the Consortium.

- **Compliance with Lead Paint Regulations.** The King County Consortium intends to comply with lead-based paint regulations and has submitted a Transition Implementation Plan to HUD, which was approved. The plan allows the Consortium to phase in the applicable HUD and EPA lead-based paint regulations as applied to permanent housing which receives federal assistance.

Activities to Benefit Low- and moderate-income Home Owners

- **Repair of existing housing units owned and occupied by low- and moderate-income homeowners.** Continue use of CDBG and HOME funds to support the King County Housing Repair Program, which provides quality, timely repair of critical health and safety problems for low- and moderate-income homeowners.
- **Acquisition of mobile home parks** Support acquisition of mobile home parks to protect low- and moderate-income mobile home owners who may otherwise be displaced due to redevelopment. CDBG, HOME, and HOF capital funds may be used for this purpose.

- **Programs which promote home ownership.** Use CDBG, HOME, and HOF capital and workforce housing funds for appropriate programs (e.g., land trusts, limited equity co-ops, sweat equity programs, etc.) which reduce the costs of home ownership for low- and moderate-income households. Related activities which the Consortium may support include homebuyer education, down payment assistance, and programs which provide reduced mortgages.
- **Homeownership opportunities at Park Lake Homes in White Center.** The Consortium supports the creation of homeownership opportunities for low- to moderate-income resident households of Park Lake and other low- to moderate-income households, through creative partnerships with first-time homebuyer programs, as a component of the proposed HOPE VI revitalization plan.

Two examples of homeownership programs include the South King county First Home program which provides purchase assistance to first-time homebuyers and the King County Open Door Program, a partnership with the Washington State Housing finance Commission, Fannie Mae, Continental Savings Bank and Norwest Mortgage which helps cover down payment and closing costs.

Obstacles to Meeting Needs

Producing rental housing affordable to households with extremely low incomes requires deep public subsidies. Operating budgets cannot support debt service and maintain affordable rents, making it increasingly difficult to produce housing for those below 30 percent of median income. Even projects with no debt service cannot cover operating costs if they are serving people with extremely low incomes, such as those on SSI. Operating and supportive service funding for people with special needs are generally difficult to access. Other barriers include lack of community support for affordable housing, increased competition for state and local funds, and an extremely tight, expensive local housing market. Higher costs result in fewer people being served. Given the high cost of homes in this area, ownership is out of reach for most households at 80 percent of median income. More assistance is needed for first-time buyers in most parts of the Consortium.

Basis for Assigning Relative Priorities

The housing needs assessment discussed in Section II provides a solid basis on which to determine the relative priorities included in the priority housing needs form. Based on data from the U.S. Census, the lowest income renters have the highest unmet needs in terms of numbers. Locally, the housing market is substantially unaffordable to households at 60% of median and below, so these income categories are given higher priority across the board than households in the 50 to 80 percent of median category.

Housing Needs Form

Table 6-3
Priority Housing Needs

	Income	Need Level	Units	Estimated \$ Needed to Address (in millions of \$)
RENTERS				
Small Related	0 to 30% of MFI	H	5,374	\$349.3
	31 to 50% of MFI	H	5,534	266.2
	51 to 80% of MFI	M	5,376	87.4
Large Related	0 to 30% of MFI	H	1,097	76.8
	31-50% of MFI	H	1,257	65.1
	51 to 80% of MFI	M	1,624	28.4
Elderly	0 to 30% of MFI	H	3,160	134.3
	31-50% of MFI	H	2,491	78.3
	51 to 80% of MFI	M	1,603	17.0
All Others	0 to 30% of MFI	H	4,694	152.6
	31-50% of MFI	H	6,039	145.2
	51 to 80% of MFI	M	5,729	46.5
OWNERS				
All Owners	0 to 30% of MFI	H	6,513	13.4
	31-50% of MFI	H	6,473	23.6
	51 to 80% of MFI	M	12,372	46.4

Units = estimated number of households in need of housing assistance (defined as households paying more than 30% of income for housing, or living in overcrowded or substandard conditions). Source for this is HUD analysis of 1990 U.S. Census data. Please see Definitions/Glossary for a description of the household types.

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

Housing Objective 2

Provide a variety of appropriate housing programs for renters and owners with special needs.

Proposed Annual Accomplishments for 2000-2003

Of the 700 units that will be developed/preserved each year under Objective #1, at least **60 units per year** will be targeted to people with special needs.

Note: Proposed accomplishments apply only to households assisted and units developed with federal CDBG, HOME, and ESG funds.

Needs Analysis

As detailed in Section II of this Plan, the mainstream systems serving Consortium residents with disabilities have done extensive work in identifying unmet housing needs. While much progress has been made to enhance the residential supports of people with disabilities in recent years, there remain significant levels of unmet housing needs.

Activities

All activities listed under housing objective #1 also serve to promote the development of special needs housing. The Consortium will seek to preserve and expand the supply of housing for people with special needs, including elderly residents, people with mental illness, people with HIV/AIDS, people who are chemically dependent, people with development disabilities, and people with physical disabilities. In addition the Consortium will undertake the following:

- Explore new approaches to providing modifications to make existing housing accessible to people with disabilities.
- Coordinate with mainstream systems regarding housing needs and priorities for the special needs populations they serve, such as the drug/alcohol system, mental health, development disabilities in efforts to strengthen the vital connection between services and housing.
- Explore and support opportunities for establishing operating and maintenance funds for the development and preservation of special needs housing. This will include exploring the feasibility of using a portion of HOME funds for tenant-based rental assistance.
- Support King County Housing Authority applications for Section 8 vouchers targeted to people with disabilities, and assist in planning for the effective use of those resources. This includes encouraging outreach to landlords in all areas of the Consortium to encourage participation in the Section 8 program.

- Where appropriate, support housing developers' applications to the HUD Section 202 and 811 programs to provide housing for seniors and people with disabilities.
- Actively promote mixed income housing developments which are socially and economically integrated. (Such approaches can generate cash flow from some units to support the subsidies needed for other units which are housing extremely low-income people.)
- Develop a Fair Housing Tool Kit as assistance to overcoming impediments to fair housing.
- Support KCHA's HOPE VI planning process for the redevelopment of units at Park Lake Homes which will meet the needs of the disabled population for handicap accessibility.
- The Consortium, KCHA, public officials and other housing partners will engage in a dialogue about visitability standards in housing development, and explore the feasibility of creating all or a portion of visitable units within new construction.

Obstacles to Meeting Needs

Among the major obstacles in the development of special needs housing include the difficulty in securing operating funds, lack of service funds to support people in housing, and community opposition to siting special needs housing. Deep capital subsidies are needed—often 100 percent—because tenant incomes among this population are not high enough to support debt service. In addition, the Consortium faces very limited capacity among service agencies and special needs housing agencies to develop and manage housing.

Basis for Assigning Relative Priorities

Because people with special needs are typically rely on fixed incomes, their need for housing assistance is extremely high. The average disability income places a single person household at about 17 percent of median income. Therefore, most of the special needs populations listed on the form below are assigned a high priority, and the Consortium intends to expand housing for these populations during the period covered by this Plan.

Housing Needs Form: Special Needs Housing

Table 6-4
Special Needs/Non-Homeless

Sub-Population	Priority Need	Estimated \$ Needed to Address (in millions)
Elderly	H	\$63.8
Frail Elderly	H	(included above)
Severe Mental Illness	H	\$69.0
Developmentally Disabled	H	\$33.8
Physical Disabilities	H	\$20.0
Persons with Alcohol/Other Drug Addiction	H	\$33.3
Persons with HIV/AIDS	M	\$ 4.1
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL		\$224

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

Housing Objective 3

Provide services and facilities to prevent homelessness and to address the needs of families and individuals when homelessness occurs.

Proposed Annual Accomplishments for 2000-2003

- Of the 700 units that will be developed/preserved each year under Objective #1, approximately **40 units** will be emergency, transitional and/or permanent housing targeted for people who are homeless. (About 160 units over the 4-year period.)
- Provide emergency shelter and transitional housing assistance to approximately **1,000 homeless individuals and families** each year.
- Provide homeless prevention services (primarily eviction prevention assistance) to approximately **200 households** each year.

Please note that these are estimates only, since the type of units developed will vary from year to year depending on the nature of projects funded and other factors. These goals would include any housing development where any federal dollars have been contributed. In many developments, federal funds are highly leveraged.

Needs Analysis

King County has a serious and growing homelessness problem, with an estimated 5,500 people homeless on any given night in King County. Single adults, families, and unattached youth are living in shelters, on the streets, in cars, in campgrounds, and in the woods throughout King County. We estimate that roughly one-third of the homeless population is in the Consortium—that is, outside the City of Seattle.² Turnaways from emergency shelter have increased 49 percent from 1995 to 1997, and calls to the local crisis line from homeless people seeking assistance jumped 29 percent from 1996 to 1997.

Activities

The activities detailed in housing objectives #1 and #2 will also support the increase in housing for homeless people. Other Consortium activities will include:

- The Consortium will allocate approximately \$200,000³ annually in Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds to community-based organizations. Priority for the use of ESG funds is to support operating costs and

² About half of the homeless callers to the county's primary information and referral line come from the Consortium. However, this is not necessarily reflective of the distribution of the homeless population, but rather may indicate that the homeless population is growing most rapidly within the Consortium.

³ The ESG formula grant amount is dependent of federal McKinney allocations and changes from year to year.

essential services for emergency shelters for homeless people (including motel vouchers, where appropriate). Priority will be given to those programs which participate in the regional continuum of care, linking shelter recipients to other appropriate services.

- The Consortium will allocate CDBG funds to help prevent homelessness. Pending approval by the pass-through cities, the Consortium will continue to support the Housing Stability Program⁴ which provides short-term financial assistance to prevent eviction or foreclosure (approximately \$300,000 per year; variable depending on CDBG formula grant level).
- The Consortium will strive to ensure that all homeless projects supported with local, state, and federal funds are consistent with the vision, principles, and recommendations issued by Seattle-King County Homelessness Advisory Group, Winter 1998 (and with any subsequent updates that may occur over the life of this Consolidated Plan).
- The Consortium will continue to provide leadership and participation in the countywide McKinney Continuum of Care competition, or its successor. King County, on behalf of the Consortium, will continue to administer McKinney funds awarded for any new Supportive Housing Program, and for existing and new Shelter Plus Care grants.
- The Consortium will continue to be involved in efforts to improve the efficiency and accountability of the regional homeless service system, including a commitment to move toward outcomes.

Obstacles to Meeting Needs

Despite extensive local progress in developing an effective continuum of services for homeless people, many significant barriers remain. As with special needs housing, the lack of operating and support service funding is one the greatest challenges faced by housing developers seeking to undertake a project for homeless people. Mainstream systems that have primary responsibility for people with mental illness, developmental disabilities, drug/alcohol dependency, and minors often do not provide sufficient residential supports for their homeless clients. Further, the decreasing allocation of federal McKinney funds to the King County area is resulting not only in a decline in much-needed new programs, but has begun to undercut the system that is in place. Existing housing resources for homeless people have been cut due to the shrinking federal support.⁵

⁴ For more information about this project, please see Appendix I, Housing Related Resources.

⁵ In the 1998 competition, lack of funding for Shelter Plus Care renewal resulted in the reduction of 136 units of permanent housing for homeless people with disabilities.

Basis for Assigning Relative Priorities

The following continuum of care gaps analysis was prepared for the 1998 McKinney competition, and covers *all* areas of King County, including the City of Seattle. It is based on extensive community input and was reviewed by the Seattle-King County Coalition for the Homeless.

The methodology used to calculate the figures in the charts found on the next pages is dependent on the population, service slots, and inventory at any one point in time. The February 1998 *Background Report* prepared for the Homelessness Advisory Group served as the reference for most of the information. Additional information was obtained from several governmental entities, such as King County Mental Health Division, King County Veterans Program, City of Seattle HOPWA Program, and Seattle-King County Department of Public Health (Health Care for the Homeless and Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse). As a guide to help explain the methodology, a brief explanation is offered:

- *Estimated bed/day for supportive service slots* is based on a percentage of homeless individuals or families who are in need of that particular service. For families, an assumption is made that an average family is composed of 3 individuals and that one of these persons is a parent.
- *Current inventory for supportive service slots* is based on the number of units dedicated to that particular need and/or a percentage of the total units available. The same percentage used to calculate the estimated bed/day figure is used to calculate the current inventory. Because the Gaps Analysis is based on need and inventory at any given time, a vacancy rate of 5% is used to calculate the number of services/units available, with the exception of substance abuse treatment. That rate is 3%.
- *Estimated need/day for sub-populations* is based on the percentage of the total population for that sub-population, with the exception of youth. The figures shown are estimates from surveys and reports from countywide homelessness response system.
- *Current inventory for sub-populations* is based on the number of units dedicated to that particular sub-population and/or a percentage of the total units available. The same percentage used to calculate the estimated bed/day figure is used to calculate the current inventory. Again, we use a vacancy rate of 5% to calculate the number of units available at any given time.

In the Individuals Chart, victims of domestic violence are not calculated but are included in the figures found in the Family with Children Chart.

1. Housing Needs Form: Homeless

Table 6-5
Homeless Continuum of Care Gaps Analysis

INDIVIDUALS

		Estimated Need/Day	Current Inventory ⁶	Unmet Need/Gap	Relative Priority
Beds/Units	Emergency Shelter	2391	1898	493	H
	Transitional Housing	507	27	480	H
	Permanent Supportive Housing	725	76	649	H
	TOTAL	3623	2001	1622	---
Supportive Service Slots	Job Training	2400	250	2150	H
	Case Management	2700	750	1950	M
	Substance Abuse Treatment	2424	66	2358	H
	Mental Health Care	2174	436	1738	M
	Housing Placement	1800	1350	450	M
	Life Skills Training	1200	900	300	L
Sub- populations	Chronic Substance Abusers	2174	66	2108	H
	Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI)	2174	1232	942	M
	& Dually Diagnosed	[Dual diagnosis #s combined with SMI, above]			
	Veterans	1449	486	963	H
	Persons with HIV/AIDS	120	11	109	M
	Victims of Domestic Violence	See families section that follows			
	Youth	500	71	429	H
	Chronically Homeless Women	616	199	417	H

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

THIS FORM, INCLUDING RELATIVE PRIORITIES, WILL BE UPDATED ANNUALLY AS PART OF THE SEATTLE-KING COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE APPLICATION PROCESS.

⁶ To be consistent with column 1—estimated need per day—“Current Inventory” shows the estimated number of units/slots available on a given day (not the total inventory, which would understate the gap since most of the currently inventory is filled on any given day).

Table 6-6
Homeless Continuum of Care Gaps Analysis

PERSONS IN FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

		Estimated Need/Day	Current Inventory⁷	Unmet Need/Gap	Relative Priority
Beds/Units	Emergency Shelter	1239	725	514	H
	Transitional Housing	224	20	204	H
	Permanent Supportive Housing	375	76	299	H
	TOTAL	1838	821	1017	---
Supportive Service Slots	Job Training	600	150	450	H
	Case Management	750	300	450	L
	Child Care	863	233	630	M
	Substance Abuse Treatment	250	66	184	H
	Mental Health Care	188	73	115	M
	Housing Placement	940	300	640	M
	Life Skills Training	800	600	200	L
Sub- populations	Chronic Substance Abusers	250	66	184	H
	Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI)	188	73	115	M
	& Dually Diagnosed	[Dual diagnosis #s combined with SMI, above]			
	Veterans	15	0 ⁸	15	M
	Persons with HIV/AIDS	21	3	18	L
	Victims of Domestic Violence	375	81	294	M
	Teen Mothers	225	5	220	H

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

THIS FORM, INCLUDING RELATIVE PRIORITIES, WILL BE UPDATED ANNUALLY AS PART OF THE SEATTLE-KING COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE APPLICATION PROCESS.

⁷ To be consistent with column 1—estimated need per day—“Current Inventory” shows the estimated number of units/slots available on a given day (not the total inventory, which would understate the gap since most of the currently inventory is filled on any given day).

⁸ Families with members who are veterans or eligible for veteran’s benefits do not have programs specifically targeted as such. They do, of course, access the wider system of homeless services for families in our community.

Housing Objective 4

Support a broad mix of housing initiatives and programs designed to increase the supply of affordable housing and access to it.

In addition to its direct funding of housing programs, the Consortium will engage in an array of critical activities which help leverage other resources to complement the federal funds, ensure equitable access to publicly funded housing, and promote coordination with other funders and housing providers. These activities are listed below.

- **Increase funding base.** Support legislation and other initiatives designed to increase state and local funding for affordable housing and homeless programs.
- **Linkages with public housing authorities.** Work closely with the King County and Renton Housing Authorities in developing and implementing their plans to carry out public housing reform legislation.
- **Incentives.** As appropriate, support activities designed to stimulate affordable housing development, including incentive programs, use of surplus property, removal of regulatory barriers, land banking, and more.
- **Technical assistance.** Provide housing development technical assistance to non-profit organizations.
- **Fair housing.** Analyze barriers to fair housing choice, and take steps to counter discrimination in the rental, sale, and financing of housing.
- **Coordination with other funders.** Promote coordination with other housing funders, housing advocacy and information groups, and subregional housing entities. Working with other funders, simplify and streamline the application, contracting, and monitoring process for capital funds.
- **Linkages with welfare-to-work initiatives.** Support workforce housing initiatives, building links to welfare-to-work programs as appropriate.
- **Efforts to preserve the loss of project-based Section 8** and other subsidized housing with expiring subsidies. Participate in planning for and carrying out strategies to minimize the loss of project-based Section 8 units as contracts expire.
- **Efforts to preserve mobile home parks,** which are at risk of loss due to redevelopment.
- **Shared housing.** Continue to explore whether there is sufficient demand in the Consortium to warrant creation of shared housing/roommate matching services. If so, take steps to examine potential program designs and funding sources.
- **Public education.** Take steps to continually educate the public about the nature and extent of affordable housing problems in the King County Consortium in an effort to build support to increase the funding base and enhance community acceptance of low-income housing.

C. Objectives for Suitable Living Environment (Community Development)

Objectives of CDBG program. The primary objective of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program is “the development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunities, principally for persons of low- and moderate-income.” Eligible activities must meet one of the three following national objectives: 1) principally benefit low- and moderate-income persons; 2) eliminate slum and blight; or 3) address an urgent need (for more information about the CDBG Program see Appendix B).

The Consortium’s non-housing community development objectives are intended to address gaps in funding for public infrastructure, to improve community facilities, and to provide support a range of health and human services. The cost of the capital improvements, services and financial commitments needed to meet these objectives in the Consortium, however, far outweigh the available resources. The challenge for the Consortium will be coordinating available resources to meet the high priority needs of the region. The non-housing community development objectives reflect the types of activities the Consortium will use to meet the federal goals (these objectives are not ranked in order of importance):

- *Community Development Objective 1.* Improve flood/storm drain systems, water systems, sewer systems, sidewalks and other public infrastructure in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods including improving access for persons with disabilities by removal of architectural barriers in existing infrastructure;
- *Community Development Objective 2.* Acquire and/or improve public and nonprofit facilities which benefit low- and moderate-income residents or remedy slum/blight conditions; Improve access for persons with disabilities by removal of architectural barriers;
- *Community Development Objective 3.* Enhance the quality of life for families and individuals by supporting health and human services which predominantly serve low- and moderate-income residents;
- *Community Development Objective 4.* Assess community development needs and ensure compliance with applicable federal regulations.

Methodology for Identifying Needs

Various methods were used to gather information on the community development needs of the King County Consortium including: 1) review and analysis of available King County data from needs assessments, plans and reports; 2) survey of Pass-through cities' community development needs; 3) survey of small cities' infrastructure needs; 4) survey of public and nonprofit agencies' community facility needs and 5) needs assessments for the *King County Community Services Division Strategic Plan* that were conducted in east urban and rural King County consisting of resident telephone surveys, key informant interviews and meetings with service providers. The Community Services Division will complete the needs assessments for the north and south urban area by 2000. The results of the needs assessments will be included in future amendments to the Consolidated Plan.

Community Development Objective 1

Public Infrastructure Improvements and Park Facilities

Improve flood/storm drain systems, water systems, sewer systems, sidewalks, and other public infrastructure in low- and moderate-income and/or blighted neighborhoods including improving access for persons with disabilities by removal of architectural barriers in existing infrastructure.

Need Analysis

Most of the Consortium's low- and moderate-income or blighted neighborhoods are older and either lack public infrastructure and park facilities or have infrastructure and facilities which need rehabilitation or replacement. Local governments, which are responsible for funding and maintaining public infrastructure and park facilities, prioritize project funding in comprehensive plans and capital improvement programs required under State law. The Consortium's CDBG funds are used to augment local government funds and expedite implementation of projects in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods which would otherwise be delayed.

Needs typically include replacement of public infrastructure and park facilities which have deteriorated and reconstruction of sidewalks and park facilities in order to remove barriers to persons with disabilities. In a few instances, local governments need to install infrastructure which did not previously exist.

Community Development Needs Form

Table 6-7
Public Infrastructure and Parks Needs

Public Infrastructure Improvements	Need Level	Estimated \$ Needed to Address (in millions)
Flood/Storm Drain Improvements	H	\$65.0
Water/Sewer Improvements	H	40.0
Street Improvements	H	10.0
Sidewalks	H	31.0
Tree Planting	M	0.3
Removal of Architectural Barriers	H	1.0
TOTAL		\$147.3

Public (Community) Facilities	Need Level	Estimated \$ Needed to Address (in millions)
Parks, Recreational Facilities	H	\$45
TOTAL		\$45

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

Basis for Assigning Relative Priorities

King County, the Pass-through cities, and seven of the smaller suburban cities completed a survey to identify their priority needs for public infrastructure improvements. The jurisdictions used their comprehensive plans, capital improvement programs and citizen comments at public meetings to develop their priorities. The high priority public infrastructure and park facility needs in the Consortium are: flood/storm drain system improvements, water and sewer system improvements, street improvements, sidewalk improvements, installing curb cuts at sidewalks, and park/recreational facility improvements

Activities

The Consortium will use CDBG funds to support construction and rehabilitation of public infrastructure and park facilities which reflect high priority needs. Activities will include:

- construction or rehabilitation of flood/storm drain systems, water systems, sewer systems, streets, sidewalks and park facilities; and
- reconstruction of existing sidewalk and park facilities in order to remove barriers to persons with disabilities.

Obstacles to Meeting Needs

The major obstacles to meeting public infrastructure and park facility needs are: identifying and accessing other sources of funds to implement projects; limited local government staff resources to develop and manage projects; limited funds available; and political complexities associated with addressing infrastructure deficiencies. The latter point should not be underestimated. When addressing infrastructure deficiencies (such as inadequate water and sewer systems) communities must make difficult political choices. Often communities must accept growth and its associated impacts when the constricting effect of infrastructure deficiencies are removed. Not everyone wants growth, thus projects are slowed or sometimes canceled when interest groups mobilize in response to projects that increase capacity for growth. In addition, the siting of park improvements (such as skateboard park facilities) can generate significant opposition from neighborhood groups, when the neighborhood environment would be changed as a result of the project.

Proposed Annual Accomplishments for 2000-2003

- Provide subrecipient technical assistance and contract management to **10 public infrastructure and park facility projects and 5 projects to remove architectural barriers** annually; and
- Complete 2 public infrastructure and park facility projects and 4 projects to remove architectural barriers annually.

Community Development Objective #2

Public (Community) Facilities

Acquire and/or improve public and nonprofit facilities which benefit low- and moderate-income residents or remedy slum/blight conditions; Improve access for persons with disabilities by removal of architectural barriers.

Need Analysis

Facilities which serve low- and moderate-income residents and/or slum/blighted neighborhoods of the Consortium are either owned by local governments or nonprofit organizations and are typically used to provide health and human services. Several cities in the Consortium own and operate senior centers. The County owns and operates public health clinics as well as a regional drug and alcohol inpatient treatment facility. Several school districts provide facilities for programs serving low- and moderate-income families including childcare, Head Start and programs for developmentally disabled students. Most other health and human services are provided by nonprofit organizations under contract with State, County and city governments.

Local governments which own and operate health and human service facilities prioritize project funding in comprehensive plans and capital improvement programs required under State law. The Consortium's CDBG funds are used to augment local government funds and expedite implementation of projects which would otherwise be delayed due to lack of resources.

Nonprofit health and human service agencies have limited resources due to their reliance on public funding, private grants and client fees. They must balance their need for facilities with the demand for services. Many of these agencies are required to locate in areas zoned for commercial activities and compete with for-profit businesses which bid up sale prices and rents.

Community Development Needs Form

Table 6-8
Public (Community) Facilities

Public (Community) Facilities	Priority Need	Estimated \$ Needed to Address (in millions)
Senior Centers	H	\$4.0
Youth Centers	M	3.0
Child Care Centers	H	2.0
Abused and Neglected Children Facilities	M	1.0
Handicapped Centers	H	1.0
Neighborhood Centers - Food Banks, Substance Abuse Treatment Facilities, Social Service Centers, etc.	H	2.0
Parking Facilities	M	0.5
Solid Waste Disposal Improvements	M	1.0
Fire Stations/Equipment	M	1.0
Health Facilities	H	1.0
Asbestos Removal	L	0
Clean-up of Contaminated Sites	M	0.2
Interim Assistance	L	0
Non-Residential Historic Preservation	M	0.6
TOTAL		\$17.3

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H=High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M=Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L=low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

Basis for Assigning Relative Priorities

The Consortium assigned the level of priorities based on eligibility. CDBG funds must be used primarily for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons. General purpose community centers and youth centers are a high priority in many communities but serve the general public making it impossible to verify the income level of facility users. The Consortium ranked as high the types of facilities for which benefit to primarily low- and moderate-income persons can be verified. Jurisdictions will use their general funds or find other funds to support facility needs which are not CDBG eligible.

The Consortium has identified the following needs as high priority based on key informant interviews with local governments and nonprofit health and human service agencies, previous applications, and comments at public hearings:

- **Senior Centers**

Facilities which are used to provide social and recreational services for senior citizens including adult day health programs.

- **Child Care Centers**

Facilities which provide services to low- and moderate-income children such as Head Start and Early Childhood programs.

- **Handicapped Centers**

Facilities which are used to provide services for mentally ill children and adults; and youth and adults with disabilities.

- **Neighborhood Centers**

Facilities which are used to provide a variety of social services targeted primarily to low-income persons including: food banks; literacy programs; emergency financial assistance; and case management and counseling services.

- **Health Facilities**

Facilities which are used to provide services targeted primarily to low-income persons including: prevention, assessment and treatment services for alcoholism and substance abuse; public health services such as Women, Infants and Children (WIC); and primary care and dental services.

Activities

The Consortium will use CDBG funds to support acquisition, construction and rehabilitation of community facilities which reflect high priority needs. Activities will include:

- acquisition of property by nonprofit health and human service agencies which are either leasing facilities and/or require satellite facilities;
- construction or rehabilitation of both public and nonprofit facilities to expand service delivery capacity;
- rehabilitation of both public and nonprofit facilities to address deferred maintenance or health and safety issues; and
- rehabilitation of both public and private facilities in order to remove barriers to persons with disabilities.

Obstacles to Meeting Needs

The major obstacles to meeting public facility needs are: limited funding available; accessing private and other funds for implementation of projects - agencies often have multiple facility needs which compete for capital funds; developing community support for projects; identifying subrecipient implementing agencies with the capacity and willingness to work within federal regulatory guidelines and requirements; limited availability of appropriately

zoned land; and in rural areas, facility improvements are dependent on having adequate water and sewer infrastructure in place.

Proposed Annual Accomplishments 2000-2003

- Provide technical assistance to **30 public facility projects and 10 facility projects** to remove architectural barriers annually; and
- Complete **10 public facility projects and 5 facility projects** to remove architectural barriers annually.

Community Development Objective 3

Non-Housing Public (Human) Services

Enhance quality of life for families and individuals by supporting health and human services which predominantly serve low- and moderate-income residents, including older adults, and low- and moderate-income children and youth.

Needs Analysis

Public (human) services are an important component in making communities more livable by enhancing the quality of life for low- and moderate-income residents. Public services range from basic needs services such as assistance with accessing food, clothing and shelter to recreational and social activities for seniors and youth. Services related to housing such as operating support for emergency shelters, transitional housing and other housing support services are discussed in the previous section on Decent, Affordable Housing.

CDBG funds can be used for a variety of human services which primarily benefit low- and moderate-income persons. The amount of funds available for public services is further limited by federal statute to 15% of the annual grant entitlement plus program income (approximately \$1 million annually in recent years).

Up to \$300,000 of the Consortium's available public service funds are used annually to fund the Housing Stability Project which provides emergency grants and loans to Consortium residents at-risk of losing their housing. The balance of public service funds is then distributed among the sixteen Pass-through Cities and the County to allocate to local needs. The County and cities use CDBG funds in conjunction with other federal, state, local and private funds to address the human service needs of their communities.

King County and the Pass-through Cities used a variety of methods to determine their priority non-housing CDBG needs. Methods used include human service needs assessments, public comments and meetings with human service providers, Council adopted priorities, service utilization, and other needs data.

King County Community Services Division is in the process of developing a *Community Services Division Strategic Plan* which will guide the allocation of the County's current expense human services funds. The Plan will include a needs assessments and implementation strategies to address priority needs for the sub-regions of King County – North Urban, East Urban, South Urban, South Rural, East Rural, and Vashon Island. King County will also be working with the City of Seattle to coordinate those services that the County has regional responsibility for to address the regional human service needs of Seattle residents.

Housing and human service needs assessments for four of the sub-regions – the East Urban, East Rural, South Rural and Vashon Island have been completed for the *Strategic Plan*. The information gathered from those needs assessments which included resident telephone surveys and key informant interviews are included below. The needs assessments for the South Urban and North Urban areas will be completed by early 2000. The King County Consortium will use the results of those needs assessments for the public service priorities for the Consolidated Plan. The Consolidated Plan will be amended if any of the information results in substantial changes to the Plan.

The telephone survey for the East Urban area was conducted in 1997. The survey interviewed 2,000 residents of the following cities: Bellevue, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Issaquah, Kirkland, Medina, Mercer Island, Newcastle, Redmond, Yarrow Point, and the previously unincorporated area of East Sammamish (now incorporated as the City of Sammamish) and the unincorporated area east of Newcastle.

The telephone survey for East Rural, South Rural and Vashon Island were conducted in 1998. The survey interviewed 1,218 residents of the following cities: Black Diamond, Carnation, Duvall, Enumclaw, Maple Valley, North Bend, Skykomish, Snoqualmie, and the unincorporated areas of rural King County including Vashon and Maury Island. Key informant interviews were also conducted with 55 individuals including community leaders, school superintendents, service providers and elected officials in the rural area.

Community Development Needs Form

Table 6-9
Public (Human) Services Needs

Public (Human) Services	Need Level	Estimated \$ Needed to Address (in millions)
Crime Awareness	M	\$5.0
Senior Services	H	\$10.0
Youth Services	H	\$25.0
Child Care Services	H	\$20.0
Abused and Neglected Children Services	M	\$15.0
Public Services - General (Basic needs and emergency services)	H	\$30.0
Handicapped Services	M	\$10.0
Legal Services	M	\$5.0
Transportation Services	M	\$50.0
Substance Abuse Services	M	\$30.0
Employment Training	H	\$25.0
Health Services	H	\$50.0
Mental Health Services	M	\$30.0
Screening for Lead-Based Paint/Lead Hazards		0
Other - Domestic Violence Services	H	\$25.0
TOTAL (in millions)		\$330.0

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

Basis for Assigning Relative Priorities

The level of priority for the needs was based on eligibility. Public services such as youth services are a high priority for the Consortium but are more difficult to establish eligibility under the CDBG regulations since the funds are to primarily benefit low- and moderate-income persons. Jurisdictions often fund youth services with their general funds and use CDBG funds for other activities such as senior services because seniors are considered by HUD to be primarily low- and moderate-income. An exception is the City of Tukwila which is able to fund recreation services for youth because the city's percent of low- and moderate-income residents meets the HUD criteria of being predominantly low- and moderate-income.

The following is an aggregate list of non-housing public service need priorities identified by the cities and the County: basic needs services (food, clothing, and emergency services), child care, employment training, health services, domestic violence services, senior services, and services for low- and moderate-income youth. Each jurisdiction has selected one or more of the above priorities to meet their local needs.

Senior Services In 1990, the total number of older adults (60 and older) in the King County Consortium was 124,237 or 15.4% of the total Consortium population compared to the county-wide average of 14.7%. The Consortium older adults who live in south King County total 52.3%, while 35.2% live in east King County and 12.4% live in north King County. The percent of older adults is expected to increase faster than any other age group. The greatest increase will be in those age 85 years and older who tend to be more frail and need more services.

The older adults population is also becoming more ethnically diverse. The percent of minority older adults is increasing faster than the percent of Caucasian older adults. Minority older adults tend to have lower incomes, are more isolated, are less likely to access services, and may need bilingual, culturally appropriate services.

The major issues facing the older adults are the need for affordable health, mental health, dental care, adult day care, in-home services, assisted living, and transportation services. Many of the older adults are living on fixed incomes and pay a higher proportion of their incomes on health care. The older adults also prefer to live as independently as possible, with an increase need for in-home services, adult day care and assisted living which allows them to remain in their homes with support. Transportation services to access meals and other activities at senior centers, to doctor's appointments and other social services is a growing need. There is also a growing demand for specialized transportation services for older adults persons with disabilities who are unable to use public transportation.

Youth Services Residents of rural King County identified lack of youth activities as a major problem area in their community second only to lack of affordable housing. Forty-five percent of residents were concerned about the lack of activities for school age children and teenagers as well as a lack of facilities that offer youth programs. Other concerns in the rural area included: teen pregnancy, youth substance abuse, and youth violence. Key informants stated that there is an increase in drug abuse among youth on the eastside. One of the major obstacles was poor or no transportation for youth who would like to attend education and recreational activities outside their neighborhoods

Twenty-six percent of residents of east King County identified lack of activities for children and teens as a major or moderate problem in their community. Twenty-five percent were concerned about teen pregnancy and teens dropping out of school.

The 1996 Shoreline Human Services Needs Assessment identified the following issues with children and youth: an increase in number of children not being ready to learn when they attend school, youth substance abuse problems, and lack of services for children and youth involved in domestic violence or abuse.

The 1996 Renton Human Services Needs Assessment identified youth crime as the highest concern among Renton residents. Sixty-four percent of the 408 residents who participated in a phone survey rated crime or violence among youth as a major or moderate problem. Alcohol or drug abuse among youth was rated the third highest concern.

United Way of King County conducted a telephone survey of 1,200 residents in 1997. Seventeen percent of the residents stated they have had a problem with crime or with crime/and or violence committed by youth.

A study of violence in 1994 by the Seattle-King County Department of Health revealed that youth violence had significantly increased in King County. In 1994, the homicide rate among youth had doubled since 1987. Youth age 15 to 24 were victims of violent crimes at higher rates than those of any age group with youth age 15 to 17 having the highest rates of rape, robbery and aggravated assault.

Child Care It is estimated that 60% of all children need child care services. There are currently approximately 42,300 licensed child care slots in King County. Child Care Resources estimates that there is a gap of 33,000 child care slots needed to meet the demand for child care services in King County.

A lack of affordable child care was rated as a major to moderate problem by almost a third of the east King County residents (32%), rural King County residents (28%) and Renton residents (31%) who participated in recent telephone surveys to determine human service needs in their communities.

For many families finding quality, affordable child care is a problem. Service providers have seen an increased demand for before and after school scholarships, child care subsidies, child care for special needs children and child care especially for infant care, evening, part-time and weekend hours. For low-income working families, finding affordable child care is almost impossible without some kind of subsidy.

***Abused and
Neglected
Children***

The Washington State Child Protective Services reported a total of 5,209 accepted cases of physical and mental child abuse in 1998 for King County which is an increase of 130% from 1995. A total of 7,443 cases of physical, medical and pre-natal child neglect were reported in 1998, an increase of 157% from 1995. Abused and neglected children are a higher risk for doing poorly in school, suffering from emotional problems, and abusing alcohol and other substance.

Thirty-six percent of east King County residents and 33% of rural King County residents identified child abuse and neglect as a moderate to major household problem. Cities in south King County have identified prevention of child abuse and neglect as a priority need in their communities.

***Basic Needs
Services***

A 1997 Food Lifeline King County Food Bank Study identified 84,496 persons in 25,406 households in King County outside the City of Seattle needing food bank services. The results of the study determined that 42% of the persons served are children (65% of the households live in north and east King County and 71% of the households live in south King County) while 16% are older adults. Food banks throughout the state of Washington noted an increase of 13% in food bank usage in the final quarter of 1997 due to implementation of welfare reform. Food banks can also help families and individuals prevent homelessness. By receiving food and other essential grocery items, families and individuals can use their income toward housing costs.

Eighteen percent of east King County residents and 25% of rural King County residents identified that lack of money for food and clothing is a moderate to major household problem. Food banks in south King county report that the requests for food bank assistance is continuing to grow, with the greatest increase in working families with children. Food banks are now providing on-going support to low-income working households instead of being an emergency resource. One-third of the residents of the City of

Shoreline have difficulty affording basic need services such as food, shelter and utility bills.

Various city needs assessments also identified the need for basic services as a high priority for their cities. Human service providers surveyed in the 1998 City of Tukwila Human Services Plan identified the need for emergency services such as food, clothing, housing, utility bills, and rent assistance. The 1996 City of Shoreline Human Services Needs Assessment cited that three times as many of their residents compared to County residents called the Community Information Line about emergency food resources and four times as many requested assistance with utility bills.

Employment Training

Although the unemployment rate has decreased in King County, the increase in employment has been in the service industry or in temporary jobs where wages are lower and there are fewer benefits. Though there has also been an increase in the high tech industry, these positions require skilled workers. Populations who are having the most difficulty accessing employment are refugees and immigrants who lack English speaking abilities and persons currently on Temporary Assistance to Needy Families who are transitioning to work.

Various needs assessment also identified underemployment (i.e., not having jobs that pay enough for basic needs) as a major problem. Fifteen percent of all residents surveyed by United Way in 1997 think more jobs, particularly more jobs that pay a livable wage would be most important in improving the quality of life in their communities. Twenty-one percent of all households surveyed by United Way have had a problem in the last year with unemployment or underemployment (having a job that does not pay enough for the basics of food, shelter and clothing). Thirty-seven percent of the rural King County residents and 29% of east King County residents surveyed rated underemployment as a major to moderate problem.

Health Services

The 1997 telephone survey of east King County, revealed that 30% of residents identified lack of affordable medical care as a major or moderate problem and 23% of residents identified lack of affordable dental care as a major or moderate problem. Human service providers stated that access to primary medical and dental care is a problem, especially for Medicaid, low-income and uninsured persons.

The 1998 telephone survey of 1,218 rural King County residents, revealed that 32 % of residents identified lack of affordable medical care as a major or moderate problem while 27% identified a lack of affordable dental care as a major or moderate problem in the community. Key informants cited lack of local medical/dental services and facilities as the second highest priority for the rural area (the highest priority was lack of affordable housing).

A United Way survey conducted in 1997 revealed that 22% of all King County residents stated that the total cost of health care affected their ability to pay for other household necessities. The telephone survey in east and rural King County also revealed that not being able to pay for or get medical insurance and not being able to pay for medical bills were two of six most frequently cited problems experienced by households who were surveyed.

Domestic Violence Services

According to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs there were 13,954 domestic violence offenses reported to the police in 1997, an increase of 17% from 1996. Domestic violence offenses are ones that have been reported, investigated and verified as domestic violence incidents. These offenses include homicide, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, theft, arson and violation of the no contact orders.

Fifty-nine percent of the offenses were from King County outside the City of Seattle. Domestic violence has been the largest cause of injury to women. In fact, 22 - 35% of women who visit emergency rooms are the result of battering.

Over 2,000 victims of domestic violence and their children received services through the King County funded network of shelters and agencies. Services included legal advocacy, counseling, shelter, transitional housing, support groups, and assistance with finding safe, permanent housing, financial aid, employment, education and child care.

A resident telephone survey conducted in 1998, revealed that 31% of the residents in rural King County identified domestic violence as a major or moderate problem in their community. A key informant reported that victims in the rural area are reluctant to use services for fear of the community finding out about their problem. Often victims in rural areas must travel quite a distance to receive services, and leave behind their support systems.

Other needs assessments also rated domestic violence as a major problem in their communities. Domestic violence and child abuse was rated as the number one problem in Renton by community leaders who participated in the 1996 Renton Human Services Needs Assessment. Domestic violence was also mentioned in the Cities of Shoreline's and Tukwila's needs assessments.

Activities

The Consortium will use CDBG funds to support basic needs services (food, clothing, and emergency services), senior services, youth services, child care, employment training, health services and domestic violence services. Activities will include but are not limited to:

- distribution of food products to food banks located in the Consortium;
- providing access to emergency food, shelter, clothing, transportation and utility assistance for low- and moderate-income persons;

- providing child care scholarships for low- and moderate-income families;
- providing employment training and counseling to immigrants and refugees;
- providing health and dental care to low- and moderate-income persons;
- supporting support services to victims of domestic violence and their children;
- providing operational support to senior centers; and
- providing recreational programs to low- and moderate-income youth.

Obstacles to Meeting Needs

Obstacles to meeting public services needs are: limited funding; limited staff resources; securing private and other sources of funds; eligibility requirements; language barriers; lack of transportation; lack of affordable services; and changing priorities.

Proposed Annual Accomplishments for 2000-2003

- Provide services to approximately **38,000 persons** annually;
- Of the 38,000 persons served annually, approximately **8,000 will be older adults**; and
- Of the 38,000 persons served annually, **100 will be low- and moderate-income youth**.

Community Development Objective 4

Planning and Administration

Assess community development needs and ensure compliance with applicable federal regulations.

Needs Analysis

King County, as the recipient of CDBG entitlement funds on behalf of the King County Consortium, is responsible for providing planning, reporting, environmental review, subrecipient monitoring, recordkeeping and related activities required by federal CDBG Program regulations.

Community Development Needs Form

Table 6-10
Planning and Administration Needs

Planning and Administration	Need Level	Estimated \$ Needed to Address (in millions)
Planning	H	\$2.0
General Program Administration	H	\$3.0
Indirect Costs (included in general administration)	L	0
Public Information (included in general administration)	L	0
Fair Housing Activities	M	\$0.5
TOTAL (in millions)		\$5.5

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

Basis for Assigning Priority Needs

CDBG funds for the use of planning activities are limited to 20% of the annual entitlement and program income. Priorities for planning funds are housing and community development needs assessment including human service needs assessments, economic development plans, and administration of the Consortium-wide and individual Pass-through Cities CDBG programs.

Activities

The Consortium will use CDBG funds for planning and administration activities. These include:

- human services needs assessment
- housing and community development needs assessments
- technical assistance to public and nonprofit agencies on development of outcome measures
- economic development plans and
- general administration of the CDBG Program.

Obstacles to Meeting Needs

Obstacles to meeting the planning needs of the Consortium are: limited funds available and limited staff resources. Planning and administration activities are limited by federal requirements to 20% of the annual entitlement and program income earned. Recently, new planning and reporting requirements as well as data systems have increased the workload of staff. Staff are inputting the same information into two data systems, Community 2020 and IDIS which are not linked. Additional staff resources are also needed to input data into the IDIS system.

Proposed Annual Accomplishments 2000-2003

- Complete housing and community development needs assessment for north and south urban areas of King County;
- Provide 12 months of administration of the CDBG program annually;
- Provide technical assistance on outcome measures;
- Submit Annual Action Plan of proposed use of federal funds;
- Submit Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report; and
- Submit other federal reports as required.

D. Objectives for Expanded Economic Opportunities (Economic Development)

One of the three main goals of the federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is to “expand economic opportunities principally for persons of low- and moderate-incomes.” This portion of the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan places this federal goal in the context of the countywide overall economic development goals and strategies, and sets the economic development objectives for the Consortium.

Specifically, this portion of the plan (1) summarizes the adopted vision and general policy direction for countywide economic development, as well as the

countywide action plan prepared in response to that vision. Next, (2) it describes the role that the Consortium's federal housing and community development funds can play in furthering the countywide goals as well as the federal goal. Finally, (3) it specifies the main economic development objectives and proposed annual accomplishments for the Consortium's CDBG funds.

1. The Adopted Countywide Vision and Policy Direction

The Countywide Planning Policies (CPP's)

All King County jurisdictions are expected to:

“cooperatively create an environment which sustains the economic vitality of the region and which contributes to manageable economic growth. Jurisdictions shall recognize that King County is part of a larger regional economy, which is strongly linked by trade to the national and international economies. Infrastructure investment should be focused into Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers which are supported by transit.”

This is the overall economic development vision and mandate adopted in 1994 by the interjurisdictional Growth Management Planning Council in the Countywide Planning Policies.

The GMPC adopted three broad policy statements enlarging on this overall vision:

- FW-33 directly links economic sustainability and the countywide land use pattern: “All jurisdictions shall contribute to the economic sustainability of the County in a manner which supports the countywide land use pattern. This is to be accomplished by providing cost-efficient quality infrastructure and public services (for example, sewer and water) at an adopted level-of-service specific to the local situation, providing affordable housing, promoting excellence in education, and protecting the environment.
- FW-34 acknowledges the importance of employment opportunities: “All jurisdictions shall act to increase work training and job opportunities for all residents and communities.”
- FW-35 directs jurisdictions to follow up and support the broad vision and policy direction of the CPP's with a regional economic development action plan or strategy: “All jurisdictions shall support the

development of a regional economic development strategy consistent with the Countywide land use pattern.”

The Countywide Planning Policies go on to establish additional policies in five specific areas. To summarize, the policies in these five areas are designed to:

- strengthen, expand, and diversify the economy;
- protect the environment as a key economic value in the region;
- address human resources in terms of the needs of economically disadvantaged citizens and neighborhoods and job training and education;
- identify important types of direct governmental actions regarding land supply, infrastructure, and permitting; and
- foster private/public partnerships.

Countywide Strategy and Action Plan to Overcome Obstacles and Further the Vision: *The Action Plan for Continued Prosperity in King County*

To follow up on FW-35, which called for development of a regional economic development strategy to further the vision and policy direction established by the CPP's, the Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County (a public-private partnership to which Seattle, King County, and a number of suburban cities belong) created the *Action Plan for Continued Prosperity in King County* in 1998.

Based on input from local governments, businesses, chambers of commerce, educational institutions, civic and community groups and advocacy organizations throughout the county, the Action Plan stresses five “action areas” that need to be addressed to continue both economic prosperity and a high quality of life. Viewed another way, if these five action areas are not adequately addressed they could be significant obstacles to meeting our economic development needs and vision. The five action areas address infrastructure and land supply, workforce development, regulatory balance, capturing business opportunities, and building support for economic development. Each has goals and specific actions appropriately undertaken by a variety of players in both the public and private sectors (see box for greater detail on the Action Plan for Continued Prosperity).

The Action Plan for Continued Prosperity in King County

Economic Development Council, 1998

1. Develop Infrastructure That Works

- ☐ Transportation goal: continue to build and maintain a transportation system that supports an expanding economy and workforce
 - Expand freight capacity
 - Expand freeway and arterial capacity
 - Reduce growth in demand through changes in travel patterns and behavior
 - Provide for needed air service
 - Develop new transportation funding techniques
- ☐ Utilities goal: retain the region's historic advantages in utility service
 - Meet growing demand for telecommunications services
 - Complete the K-20 communication backbone
 - Ensure adequate water supply
 - Preserve water quality
- ☐ Land Supply goal: balance the need for sufficient development capacity with the need to preserve open space, forest and agricultural land
 - Find consensus on a method of land capacity measurement
 - Monitor development and redevelopment rates
 - Identify options if available land is found to be inadequate

2. Build a Top-notch Workforce

- ☐ Workforce training goal: Create a workforce training system that meets the needs of employers and workers for training and skill upgrading
 - Continue improvement of K-12 education
 - Enhance the transition from school to work
 - Build on the success of community and technical colleges
 - Make the most of welfare reform
 - Improve access for workers and employers by moving toward a one-stop point of contact
- ☐ Higher education and research goal: Help ensure the continuation of world class research in the region and to capture its benefits
 - Expand research funding
 - Develop a commercialization center that provides a supportive environment for young companies growing out of research institutions

3. Maintain Regulatory Balance

- ☐ Reform of development regulations goal: create a regulatory environment characterized by predictability, fair interpretation and reasonable timeframes
 - Use area-wide environmental impact statements
 - Create one-stop permitting
- ☐ Expand affordable housing goal: ensure a sufficient supply of housing for all incomes, within the context of growth management
 - Allow innovative housing that will permit greater density while maintaining neighborhood character
 - Monitor housing production to ensure that targets are being met
 - Remove costs

4. Capture Business Opportunities

- ☐ Business recruitment and retention goal: have systems that work directly with businesses considering moving here, as well as those already here that we want to keep
 - Retain existing businesses by maintaining the capability to respond to concerns of individual employers that could lead them to relocate operations outside the region
 - Recruit manufacturing businesses to the region that are consistent with our skill base and site availability, and that pay family wages
 - Recruit technology-based businesses that are consistent with the research and educational strengths of the region and the existing technology-based business structure
 - Support investor networks that provide early funding to technology-based businesses and provide an incentive for those businesses to remain in the region
- ☐ International positioning and marketing goal: make this region a primary center of international business, commerce and tourism in North America
 - Promote international awareness of the region
 - Expand small business participation in international markets
 - Increase international tourism
 - Expand international air service

5. Build Support for Economic Development

- ☐ Public support and education goal: foster a common sense of purpose about the future quality of life in our region, with sustainable economic development strategies that minimize the conflict between economic and environmental objectives
 - Build public awareness of global trends
 - Strengthen advocacy
 - Promote accountability

2. The Role of Federal Housing and Community Development Funds in Furthering the Regional Vision and Action Plan

Federal housing and community development funds can be used to help accomplish the Consortium's economic development goals in a variety of ways. To the extent that HOME and CDBG funds are used to further our affordable housing goals consistent with the countywide land use patterns, for example, they are also furthering our economic development goals. CDBG funds in particular can be used for a wide range of activities that may further our economic development goals; for example, economic development planning; infrastructure improvements; historic preservation and commercial façade improvements in downtown areas; land acquisition and clearance; as well as technical and financial assistance to both for-profit and community-based organizations undertaking economic development activities.

Objectives for housing, planning, and infrastructure are included under the housing and community development objectives discussed earlier and will not be repeated here. This section will focus on activities that the Consortium would not include under either the housing or the community development objectives, but rather under economic development, including and especially those activities eligible under 24 CFR 570.203.

In this context, three of the countywide overall economic development goals discussed above are particularly suited to being addressed by federal CDBG funds. They are industrial and commercial land supply; increasing employment opportunities for low and moderate income people, and fostering public-private partnerships.

Industrial/ Commercial Land Capacity

Land supply is a critical regional concern addressed both in the CPP's and in the Action Plan. The CPP's are concerned that each jurisdiction plan for an adequate supply of land zoned for commercial and industrial uses to accommodate our region's job growth forecasts (in balance with land zoned for residential and other uses).

A particular countywide concern is maintaining the availability of **industrial land** where there is already adequate infrastructure, and providing for any necessary clean-up of "brownfields"--existing industrial sites which have some environmental contamination currently limiting their re-use. The redevelopment of brownfields makes efficient use of our region's limited supply of land, does not require the investment of expensive new infrastructure, and helps clean up the environment. *To the extent that brownfields redevelopment can be assisted with CDBG and other federal funds and can help provide jobs for low- and moderate-income people, it is an important priority for the King County Consortium.*

Similarly, the redevelopment of existing **commercial areas** has been identified as a priority for many local jurisdictions in their Comprehensive Plans, especially those with dilapidated business districts, often but not always serving low- and moderate-income neighborhoods. Please note that commercial redevelopment can be addressed in many different ways with CDBG dollars, from infrastructure improvements to storefront façade or historic preservation improvements to acquisition and clearance to economic development planning. In addition, in some cases the CDBG national objective being met by the activity will be remedying slum or blight conditions rather than benefiting low and moderate income persons. *To the extent that commercial area redevelopment can be assisted with CDBG and other federal funds, it is also an important priority.*

**Human
Resources:
Increasing
Employment
Opportunities for
Low and Moderate
Income People**

In terms of human resources, the CPP's note the historic disparity in income and employment opportunities for minorities, women, and economically disadvantaged individuals, and encourage all jurisdictions to develop strategies and commit resources to address the inequalities. More specifically, the CPP's also encourage identifying partnerships and funding opportunities to address job training, retraining, and educational opportunities on a county-wide basis.

Similarly, the Action Plan addresses the goal of workforce training. It specifically calls for continued improvement of K-12 education, enhancing the transition from school to work, building on the success of community and technical colleges, making the most of welfare reform, and moving toward a one-stop point of contact for workers and employers.

The King County Jobs Initiative builds on many of these suggestions. Its goal is to help low-income families, half of them recipients of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, obtain and keep jobs. In the effort to help people make a successful transition from welfare to work, as well as the transition from less-skilled to more skilled jobs, the Initiative has created partnerships with the State Department of Social and Health Services, Vocational Rehabilitation Services, and Employment Security; the King County Housing Authority; the Private Industry Council' community and technical colleges; the business community; labor organizations; and community organizations. Case management and support services—such as child care, transportation, housing, and English as a Second Language training—are also built into the program. For more information on the Jobs Initiative, see the Consortium's Anti-Poverty Strategy in Appendix G.)

To the extent that these human resource goals can be furthered through the use of CDBG funds to help create employment as well as business opportunities specifically for low- and moderate-income people, and through related workforce training and development efforts, this is an important priority for the King County Consortium.

***Public-Private
Partnerships:
Assistance to
Private, For-Profit
Businesses***

Both the CPP's and the Action Plan call for public-private partnerships. The CPP's specifically call for fostering public-private partnerships to help implement our economic development goals, and the Action Plan speaks to the particular need for business retention and recruitment.

Public-private partnerships are an important means of achieving the other economic development goals. For example, the private sector is clearly important in creating job opportunities for people attempting to transition from welfare to work (see above) because the public sector certainly cannot do it alone. While public-private partnerships are indispensable in achieving our economic development goals, it is also important to recognize that partnerships with the business community can be controversial.

On the less controversial end of the spectrum, one form these partnerships can take is support for business- and economic-oriented organizations that seek to promote our region's economic interests in general, rather than support for any single business. Examples would include participation in various Chambers of Commerce, the Economic Development Council, and other local or countywide organizations for the purposes of planning, marketing, information collection and dissemination, promotion of tourism and conventions, etc. While Consortium members may choose to use CDBG funds for this purpose, it is difficult to find an appropriate eligibility category other than planning, for which there is a federally-imposed cap. Because it is difficult to use CDBG dollars for this purpose, King County and other jurisdictions more commonly use their local public dollars for this relatively non-controversial kind of partnership.

More controversial are partnerships involving direct assistance to individual private for-profit businesses. CDBG funds are most often used for these, because the State Constitutional prohibition on the lending of credit with public dollars generally means this activity cannot be funded with local public dollars. However, direct economic development assistance to private for-profit businesses is one of many explicitly allowable uses of federal CDBG dollars.

The use of CDBG funds to provide loans, grants, or technical assistance to private for-profit businesses is not an end in itself. Rather, it is a valuable tool to be used in furthering our region's economic development goals, such as the creation of jobs for low-income people (including those making the transition from welfare to work), the retention or expansion of small and/or economically disadvantaged businesses, or the revitalization of a community's dilapidated commercial area. To be allowable this use of the funds must meet strict federal requirements, including standards for benefit to the public.

It should also be noted, however, that one reason this use of the funds can be so controversial is because it bears the potential to unduly enrich private for-profit businesses at the expense of the taxpaying public. Many citizens fear that these partnerships may be one-sided “win-lose” partnerships, with nearly all the costs on the side of the public and nearly all the benefits on the side of the business. Others fear that certain businesses will be given an unfair advantage over others in a competitive marketplace.

To prevent such giveaways and unfair advantages, and to create “win-win” partnerships, it is important to not only weigh the public benefits against the public costs, but also to keep the benefits to the business to the minimum necessary to achieve the public goals. It is also important to ensure that all eligible businesses have the opportunity to participate, not just a select few.

It is a priority of the King County Consortium to use its CDBG funds to provide direct economic development assistance to private for-profit businesses where such assistance will create or retain jobs and business opportunities for low- and moderate-income people or otherwise further the economic development goals summarized above. In providing such assistance, the Consortium will:

1. maximize public benefits,
2. minimize public costs,
3. minimize the assistance to the business, and
4. provide fair opportunities for all eligible businesses to participate.

Community Development Interim Loans (CDIL) and Section 108 Loan Guarantees. Perhaps most controversial of all are two unique financing techniques available through the CDBG fund to further the Consortium’s economic development as well as housing and community development goals. These are the Community Development Interim Loan (CDIL or “float” loan) and the Section 108 Loan Guarantee. The CDIL is an interim financing tool using the Consortium’s current but as-yet-undisbursed CDBG funds for short-term loans. The loans must be short-term as well as very secure and callable because the funds have already been committed on a permanent basis to other projects in the community, and must be made available when these other projects are ready to spend. In contrast, the Section 108 Loan Guarantee is a permanent financing tool which uses the Consortium’s future CDBG entitlement grants as the security for a federally-guaranteed long term loan. These loans must also be very secure if the Consortium is not to put its future entitlement funds at risk.

The guidelines in the following box lay out more specifically how the Consortium will balance the four considerations addressed above and create “win-win” public-private partnerships when providing economic development assistance through either a CDIL or a Section 108 Loan Guarantee

directly to private for-profit businesses. Please note that these guidelines do not apply to funds that a Consortium partner may wish to specifically set aside for the purpose of assisting local small and/or economically disadvantaged businesses or deteriorating commercial areas, such as a revolving loan fund or a grant fund for façade improvements. In these cases, Consortium partners are willing to entertain more risk that the funds will not return. These guidelines also do not apply to non-profits or governmental entities making use of CDIL's or Section 108 Loan Guarantees for housing, community facilities, or public infrastructure projects (see Appendix B for the Consortium's guidelines for these other uses of the CDIL and Section 108 Loan Guarantees).

King County Consortium Guidelines for CDIL and Section 108 Loan Guarantees to Private For-Profit Businesses

Please note that these Consortium guidelines are in addition to the federal requirements, and do not replace them. In some cases the guidelines may need to be weighed against one another. For example, on the one hand, the business must “need” the money in order to create the public benefits, otherwise the benefits will be viewed as those that “would happen anyway” and the Consortium’s investment will be viewed as unnecessary. On the other hand, the project must be a “safe” investment and not put the public’s investment at risk.

These guidelines will not apply to any funds a Consortium partner may wish to specifically set aside to assist local small and/or economically disadvantaged businesses, nor do they apply to non-profits or governmental entities making use of CDIL’s or Section 108 Loan Guarantees for housing or community development projects.

Maximize Public Benefits

At a minimum, the Consortium will:

1. Create or retain jobs that will realistically be taken by low- and moderate-income people, but that pay livable wages. Jobs should pay at or above the minimum established by the King County Jobs Initiative, and provide benefits or opportunities for training and advancement. The Consortium will *not* use CDIL or Section 108 Loan Guarantees solely to address slum or blight conditions; there must be a link to jobs.
2. Require the business to use appropriate providers as the first source to recruit, hire and train low-income individuals, including those affected by welfare reform, for entry level jobs.
3. Charge interest to the business, earning interest income to be used for other housing and community development objectives.
4. Provide reasonable certainty that the above public benefits are not ones that “would happen anyway”.

The Consortium will seek additional public benefits if possible, such as increasing the public tax base, providing apprenticeship opportunities, youth employment opportunities, etc.

Minimize Public Costs

1. Incur *no* costs to the Consortium: Use loans or loan guarantees with interest, not grants or zero-interest loans, and loan no more on average than \$35,000 for each job created.
2. Conduct due diligence to assure Consortium of financial feasibility of the project, that the public dollars are safe, and that the public benefits can reasonably be expected to occur.
3. Minimize risk and protect the public dollars by securing the loan with an irrevocable letter of credit or other security instrument.

Minimize the Assistance to the Business

1. Provide the minimum amount of loan funds at the maximum interest attainable to achieve the public benefits.
2. Provide the minimum amount of loan funds at the maximum interest attainable without causing the business endeavor to become financially infeasible.
3. Provide the minimum amount of loan funds at the maximum interest attainable without putting the public’s investment at risk.

Provide Fair Opportunities for All Businesses to Participate

1. Once a year or whenever the Consortium has sufficient funds available to lend or guarantee, make these opportunities known to all interested businesses by advertising the availability of funds in regional and local newspapers and seeking letters of interest.

3. Economic Development Objectives and Proposed Annual Accomplishments

The Consortium's primary economic development objectives are to (1) increase employment opportunities for low- and moderate-income residents, and (2) help maintain or increase the viability of our existing industrial and commercial areas.

Basis for Assigning Relative Priorities

The following form shows the HUD categories for economic development needs, the Consortium's priority for each of the HUD categories, and a rough estimate of the total funds necessary to address needs in each of those categories. Direct Financial Assistance to For-Profit Businesses is the highest priority among the HUD categories because of the direct link to job retention and creation for low-income people (see discussion in part 2 above) and because it is largely through this means that the other categories are effected.

Community Development Needs Form

**Table 6-11
Economic Development Needs**

Economic Development	Need Level	Estimated \$ Needed (in millions)
Rehab; Publicly or Privately-Owned Commercial	M	\$1.0
Commercial Industrial Land Acquisition/Disposition	M	\$3.0
Commercial Building Acquisition, Construction, Rehabilitation	M	\$12.0
Other Commercial/Industrial Improvements	M	\$4.0
Economic Direct Financial Assistance to For-Profits	H	\$35.0
Economic Development Technical Assistance	M	\$1.0
Micro-Enterprise Assistance	M	\$1.0
TOTAL		\$57.0

Note: This form is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. H= High priority such that the Consortium intends to take action in this area during the period covered by the Consolidated Plan; M= Medium priority; the Consortium may take action if opportunities arises; L= low priority; the Consortium does not intend to take action.

Proposed Annual Accomplishments 2000-2003

- Create and/or retain approximately **40 permanent jobs for low- and moderate-income persons** annually.
- Assist **3 small and/or economically disadvantaged businesses**, either in obtaining financing for business/job retention and expansion purposes, or to promote revitalization of one or more Consortium partner's commercial areas.

